DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 873 CS 501 682

AUTHOR Bryski, Bruce G.
TITLE An Analysis of Evidence in the First Ford/Carter Debate.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (New York, New York, March 24-26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Credibility; *Debate; *Persuasive Discourse; *Public Opinion; *Public Speaking; Speech Communication; Statistics
IDENTIFIERS *Ford Carter Debates

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of the general types of evidence used by Ford and Carter in the first presidential campaign debate of 1976. This evidence is analyzed in relation to the key debate subtopics, and some standard tests of evidence are employed regarding accuracy and reliability. The types of evidence considered are statistics, illustration, authority, and analogy (or comparison). Analysis revealed that (1) Carter used 961 more words than did Ford in the first debate; (2) Ford employed statistical evidence in 41 instances compared to 24 statistical citations made by Carter; (3) Carter used illustrative evidence 59 times compared to Ford's 28 times; (4) Carter made 10 references to authority, while Ford made 5; (5) Carter used comparison 6 times, and Ford used it only twice. Evidence was tested and considered by operational definition, and tests of substance, consistency, sufficiency, recency, and relevancy were also applied to the evidence. It is suggested that Carter may have been more "effective" and "accurate" than Ford was in the first debate although, according to national surveys and opinion polls, Ford won the debate. (LL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED137873

AN ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

IN

THE FIRST FORD/CARTER DEBATE

by

Bruce G. Bryski

Department of Communication
State University of New York at Buffalo

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce G. Bryski

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Paper presented at

EASTERN COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
Annual Convention
New York City, New York
March 24-26, 1977

CS 501 682

AN ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

IN

THE FIRST FORD/CARTER DEBATE

Throughout the ages, man as the social animal, has possessed an inquisitive, skeptical frame of mind. From Aristotle to the modern political rhetoric of the twentieth-century, many humans have demanded proper proof before accepting new ideas and relationships. Skeptical men have taken a critical stand, demanding much more than the "oratorical wizzardry" or colorful and emotive "catch-phrases" manifest in so many of today's persuasive encounters and discourses. The skeptic or "doubting Thomas" desires and needs concrete proof and supporting materials. The vast array of persuasive oration and discourse, in today's political arena and the utilization of evidence in political discourse, represents an essential, integral element to be examined and analyzed by the communication scholar.

Aristotle, in his Rhetoric, had laid the foundation for the necessity of proof or evidence by declaring: "A statement is persuasive and credible either because it is directly self-evident or because it appears to be proved from other statements that are so."[1]

Monroe and Ehninger substantiate that train of thought when they posit: "Most persons, especially when they are members of a sizeable audience, find it difficult to understand abstract ideas, bare and unadorned. Nor will they easily believe a proposition or act upon a proposal without stimulation or proof."[2]

McCroskey, in his numerous studies gauging the implementation of evidence in public speaking, confirms that "speeches including evidence were significantly more effective in producing attitude shift than those which included no evidence."[3] This view is in accord with the findings of Cathcart[4] and Bettinghaus[5] in which evidence was found to significantly improve the persuasiveness of speeches.

It should be noted that evidence has been used as a measure of perceived credibility, attitude change, and persuasability of speeches in both traditional and contemporary settings. Evidence has been viewed by employing both descriptive (the manner in which evidence has been observed to affect people) and prescriptive (how evidence ought to affect people) methodologies. Both the logical and psychological aspects of evidence have been examined by rhetorical critics and behaviorists alike.[6]

Although there have been conflicting findings concerning the importance and effectiveness of evidence on such variables as perceived source credibility, attitude change, and persuasiveness of public speeches,[7] many traditional and contemporary theorists suggest that there is "substantial justification for the generalization that initial credibility and evidence usage interact to produce attitude change and perceived credibility."[8] McCroskey further states, however, that "there is a major need" for more research concerning evidence in various situations and contexts. McCroskey continues by saying that concerning the "place of evidence in persuasive communication the surface of this problem area has barely been scratched. If we as communication researchers are to continue to focus our attention on message variables within the communication process, evidence should continue to be one of the major variables we study."[9]

The context of the presidential debates represents an inviting and practical situation concerning the utilization and analysis of evidence or supporting materials. The purpose, structure, and procedural concerns manifest in debate, especially political debate, are directly linked to the process of argumentation.

McBurney and Mills state that debate "consists of opposing arguments on a given proposition between a supporting affirmative and an opposing negative." Moreover, in the view taken by McBurney and Mills, "the essence of debate is the confrontation of opposing views through reasoned discourse, no matter what the special circumstances, conditions, or conventions may be under which the debate takes place."[10] Furthermore, "it should be understood that the basic principles of argumentation—analysis, reasoning, evidence, and others—enter into all rational decision-making, whether 'competitive' debate or 'cooperative' discussion is the primary approach."[11]

The general purpose of this paper is to consider the debate within its proper rhetorical situation and as a form of propositional argumentation. The focal point centers on the variable of evidence or supporting materials employed by Jimmy Carter and Gerald R. Ford in the first debate. Of course, evidence was an important variable in all three debates, but the present essay focuses only on the first debate.

Specifically, this paper provides an overview of the (1) general types of evidence used in the first debate, (2) an analysis of the types of evidence linked with six key debate sub-topics, and (3) an application of some standard tests of the evidence employed (accuracy and reliability). Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion session.

Evidence has been defined in various manners by traditional and behavioral researchers alike. For example, these two viewpoints are illustrated by the works of Miller (behavioral) and Monroe and Ehninger (traditional).[12]

Gerald Miller states that "evidence consists of those data that are intended to induce a sense of belief in the proposition which the data purportedly support."[13] Moreover, Miller prefers to examine evidence in a psychological and descriptive manner. By employing this type of analysis one is able to see evidence not as it ought to affect people, but the ways in which evidence does affect people and the "ways in which evidence often is used."[14] The Ford/Carter debates illustrate this important point because Ford and Carter probably were not so concerned about what their evidence ought to do, but rather what effect their evidence would have on the voting public.

Evidence has also been termed the basic raw material used in establishing proof.[15] A provocative analogy by Monroe and Ehninger serves as the traditional perspective of the role of evidence in argumentation and debate. Evidence and supporting materials serve ". . . to clarify, amplify, or establish as warranted the major ideas or contentions you wish to communicate. Without supporting material, the thoughts you present may be as well organized as the bones in a skeleton, but they will be equally bare and unappealing. The supporting are the flesh and blood which brings these ideas to life." [16]

A more recent summary of various perspectives on evidence can be found in the Winter, 1977 issue of Western Journal of Speech Communication. Here one can find Fisher's theoretical, Scheidel's behavioristic, and Delia and Grossberg's interpretative perspectives.[17]

The first presidential debate took place on September 23, 1976 in the Walnut Street Theater in Philadelphia. The moderator was Edwin Newman of NBC News and the questioners were Frank Reynolds of ABC News, Elizabeth Drew of The New Yorker, and James P. Gannon of The Wall Street Journal.

The first debate focused on domestic issues and economic policy only. The debate itself was a 90-minute confrontation which was interrupted by a 27-minute audio breakdown and delay that proved quite embarrassing to the ABC network, and gave the candidates an awkward situation to cope with before their summations.

The first debate was significant because it was the only debate that most observers believed Mr. Ford had won from the total of the three televised debates. The various national surveys and opinion polls verify the American perception that Ford "won" this first debate.[18]

FIRST PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE (Who Won?)

	Ford	Carter
Associated Press	34.4%	31.8%
Harris/ABC News	40%	31%
Roper	39%	31%
Gallup	38%	25%

Three of the nation's leading news-magazines: Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News and World Report also acknowledged Ford as the winner of the first debate.[19] Was this the result of the effective use of evidence by either candidate? This essay will consider that question and its implications.

The general topic of "domestic issues and economic policy" included several specific sub-topics. I have categorized the first debate into seven separate and distinct sub-topics: (1) the economy (unemployment, taxes, the budget, new programs, inflation, etc.); (2) the Nixon pardon and amnesty

issue; (3) the energy policy; (4) crime/intelligence agencies; (5) anti-Washington attitude; (6) reorganization of the federal government; and (7) other issues (trust, leadership, the future of America, summations, etc.). An analysis was then performed for Ford and Carter's responses to determine the total number of words spoken for the entire coverage of the debate in responding to the issues. An analysis was also performed to determine how the candidates covered each of the seven sub-topics in the debate.

Table 1 about here

The results of the analysis revealed that Carter used 5,818 total words; Ford 4,857. Thus, Carter used 961 more words than Ford in the first debate.

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE

Statistical evidence or data has been viewed as "testimony that asserts any fact about a sample drawn from a population or, in some cases, testimony that asserts a fact about an entire population."[20]

Miller contends that the main distinction between statistical evidence and other forms of evidence "is to be found in the alleged precision with which the former is collected and the 'typicalness' that results from such precise collection."[21]

Both Ford and Carter cited statistical evidence a great deal in discussing and responding to the issues of the first debate. Ford employed statistical evidence in 41 instances compared to 24 statistical citations for Carter.[22] This may lend some validity to the suggestion that Ford seemed to be "programmed" and a bit too "mechanical" during the first debate.

Ford and Carter both cited statistical evidence in connection with six of the debate sub-topics. Ford used more words than Carter to express his statistical evidence.[23]

Table 2 represents an illustration of statistical evidence employed by both candidates in each of the six pertinent debate sub-topics.

Table 2 about here

ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE

Illustration may be viewed as "a detailed example cast into narrative form which serves to make vivid and concrete the idea it is intended to support."[24]

Just as Ford used statistical evidence as his major type of evidence in the first debate, Carter's major type was illustration, or use of detailed example. Carter used illustrative evidence 59 times compared to Ford's 28 times in the first debate.[25]

Carter utilized vivid illustration in his responses regarding reorganization of the federal government and on the topic of energy policy. Carter, referring to government reorganization stated: "The last year I was in office our budget was actually less than it was a year before, which showed a great improvement. . . . It took me about three years to completely reorganize the Georgia government . . . . I accomplished this with substantial reductions in employees in some departments. For instance, in the Transportation Department we had - we cut back about 25 percent of the total number of employees. In giving our people better mental health care, we increased the number of employees."

Carter also employed the use of illustration or detailed example when discussing the sub-topic of energy policy: "I would certainly not cut out atomic power altogether. We can't afford to give up that opportunity until later. But to the extent that we continue to use atomic power, I would be responsible as President to make sure that the safety precautions were initiated and maintained. For instance, some that have been forgotten. We need to have the reactor core below ground level. The entire power plant that uses atomic power tightly sealed and a heavy vacuum maintained. There ought to be a full-time atomic energy specialist independent of the power company in the control room, full time, 24 hours a day, to shut down a plant if it has an abnormality develop."

Ford similarly used illustration as a type of evidence in his treatment of the economy issue and the anti-Washington attitude. On the economy issue, Ford stated:

> The immediate problem we have is to stimulate our economy now so that we can get rid of unemployment. What we have done is to hold the lid on spending in an effort to reduce the rate of inflation. And we have proven, I think very conclusively, that you can reduce the rate of inflation and increase jobs. For example, as I have said, we have added some four million jobs in the

> last 17 months. We have now employed 88 million people in America, the largest number in the history of the United States . . . . I think it's also appropriate to point out that through our tax policies we have stimulated added employment throughout the country; the investment tax credit, tax incentives for expansion and modernization of our understanding capacity.

Ford also used illustration as evidence on the sub-topic of anti-Washington attitude:

> The anti-Washington feeling, in my opinion, ought to be focused on the Congress of the United States. For example, this Congress very shortly will spend a billion dollars a year for its housekeeping, its salaries, its expenses and the like . . . . I don't think the American people are getting their money's worth from the majority party that runs their Congress . . . . Congress is hiring people by the drove and the cost as a result has gone up. And I don't see any improvement in the performance of the Congress under present leadership. So it seems to me instead of the anti-Washington feeling being aimed at everybody in Washington, it seems to me that the focus should be where the problem is, which is the Congress of the United States and particularly the majority in the Congress.

AUTHORITY REFERENCES (Testimony)

Although the majority of the evidence employed by both candidates concentrated on statistical evidence and illustration, authority references were also evident.

Authority references or testimony has been termed authority-based assertion by Miller, who states that evidence of this type is "presented by one whom the audience is likely to think of as an honest and dependable source. The content of the testimony is phrased in the form of an assertion or opinion, with little or no indication of the basis for the assertion; however, the individual using such testimony always hopes the source's reputation will be sufficient to induce audience belief that the testimony is well grounded. Thus, even more than testimony composed of statistical data (which often is not attributed to any single source), testimony composed of authority-based assertion is largely dependent upon who made the assertion rather than upon the apparent basis for what was asserted."[26] Carter cited 10 such instances compared to 5 for Ford.[27]

Ford used authority reference, for example, in the following statement: "I think the record shows, Mr. Newman, that the Bureau of Census—we checked it just yesterday—indicates that in the four years that Governor Carter was Governor of the state of Georgia, expenditures by the government went up over 50 percent."

Carter used authority references when he stated, "I think The Wall Street Journal reported not too long ago they (Federal Energy Agency) have 112 public relations experts working for the Federal Energy Agency to try to justify to the American people its own existence."

COMPARISON (Analogy)

The final type of evidence to be examined here is the use of comparison or analogy. The speaker using comparison as a type of evidence implies that "one thing is in the same general classification as another, that two objects or concepts or persons being compared are more alike than different . . . . The particularly apt comparison quickly gains wide circulation and works effectively for the speaker until its impact is dulled by too frequent repetition."[28]

Thus, comparison or analogy may be defined as similarities between something that is already known, understood, or believed by an audience and something that is not known.[29] The use of comparison or analogy in the first debate was indeed minimal. Carter used comparison 6 times, and Ford only 2 times.

Carter stated: "We've also got a comparison between himself (Ford) and Mr. Nixon. He's got four times the size of a deficit that Mr. Nixon even had himself." Carter also employed comparison as a type of evidence when he likened the American people to a great natural resource: "And the greatest resource of all are the 215 million Americans who still have within us the strength, the character, the sense of brotherhood on which we can rely in the future to restore the greatness to our country . . . . And I believe that we can bind our wounds. I believe that we can work together. And I believe that we can tap the tremendous untapped reservoir of innate strength in this country."

Ford used comparison or analogy when he stated: "The individual worker in crafts throughout the United States should not be a small cog in a big machine."

Thus, if we examine and tabulate the total number of references made concerning the four types of evidence (statistics, illustration, authority references, and comparison) we find that Carter employed evidence in 99 instances compared to 76 for Ford in the first debate.

TESTING THE EVIDENCE

It is routine if not mandatory, to consider the effectiveness of evidence as a means of inducing a belief in an individual or group. An assessment of evidence includes an analysis or testing system to gauge the effect of the evidence on the listeners. Several tests have been devised for such assessment. The Ford/Carter debates should not be exempt from these evaluations.

Evidence is tested to check the credibility of one's own evidence, to test the evidence of your opponent, and to test the credibility of evidence advanced for a decision.[30]

Three major tests of evidence may be applied to the first Ford/Carter debate. It should be noted that these tests of evidence will not treat every citation of evidence in the first debate. That would be beyond the scope of this paper. However, pertinent examples of evidence will be considered.

The first major test of evidence to be considered is that of operational definition. Miller believes that this particular test may best be applied to statistical evidence and data.[31] Operationalism "assigns meaning to a construct or a variable by specifying the activities or 'operations' necessary to measure it."[32] The concept behind this test is evident in several instances in the first debate.

Two outstanding examples of this inability to reach similar definitions between Ford and Carter are seen in the economy sub-topic and the amnesty sub-topic.

Ford asserted that "Mr. Carter wants to increase taxes for roughly half of the taxpayers of this country."[33] This assumption was based on an error in an Associated Press interview with Carter. Carter had said that he intended to "shift a substantial increase [in taxes] toward those who have the higher-incomes and reduce the income [tax] on the lower-income taxpayers." The Associated Press had dropped the words middle-income from the Carter interview statement. Thus, there was not a level of common definition as to what comprised "higher-incomes" and "middle-incomes" or "median-income." Therefore, Ford was in error as a result of the error in the Associated Press report. Carter had specifically excluded "middle-income" taxpayers from any tax increase at all.

The second instance of operational definition as a test of evidence can be seen in the sub-topic of amnesty. Indeed, Carter said: "I don't advocate amnesty; I advocate pardon. There's a difference . . . .

Amnesty means that what you did was right. Pardon means that what you did, whether it's right or wrong, you're forgiven for it . . . . " Thus, Ford and Carter had quite dissimilar notions concerning the operational definition of amnesty.

A second test of evidence may be called the tests of substance which measures the quality of the evidence itself. This test is crucial and includes (1) consistency, (2) sufficiency, (3) recency, and (4) relevancy.[34] Brief selected excerpts from the first debate serve to illustrate these four elements of the "tests of substance."

(1) Consistency. Is the evidence presented consistent with the facts of reality? No, not when Carter placed the period of the Great Depression in "the 1940's" and referred to Mr. Ford as "Mr. Nixon." Carter also was in error when he claimed that there were fewer people employed in nonfarm private jobs than when Mr. Ford took office. In fact, there was an increase of 1.8 million people in this category. Finally, Carter stated, "We've got the highest inflation we've had in 25 years right now." However, in reality, the inflation rate had been higher in 1974.

Ford had also committed errors and inaccurate use of evidence. Ford was inconsistent with known facts when he declared that the current Governor of Georgia, George Busbee, had found Georgia's Medicaid program in "a shambles." That quote does not appear in the Senate Finance subcommittee testimony Mr. Ford had cited. Ford again was inaccurate in deriding Carter's claim that there could be a $60 billion surplus by fiscal 1981 if the economy and employment grow as rapidly as Carter anticipated. Ironically, Ford's own economic advisors predicted an even greater fiscal gain of $75.5 billion.

(2) Sufficiency. Ford violated the test for sufficiency of evidence in his summation when he claimed that "our children have been the victims of mass education," without explaining why this educational goal was wrong or what he proposed to do about it. Ford also took too much credit for the $28 billion tax reduction proposed for this year. In fact, it was last year's tax cuts, the result of Congress, that resulted in the tax reduction.[35] (Italics mine.)

(3) Recency. Notice, however, that Ford supported one of his statements by using recency: "I think the record shows, Mr. Newman, that the Bureau of Census—we checked it just yesterday—indicates

that in the four years that Governor Carter was Governor of the state of Georgia, expenditures by the government went up over 50 percent." (Italics mine.)

(4) Relevancy. Two clear examples, one from Ford and one from Carter, illustrate the use of relevancy in the use of evidence. The specific sub-topic in both of these examples is the "anti-Washington attitude." Ford stated: "The anti-Washington feeling, in my opinion, ought to be focused on the Congress of the United States. For example, this Congress very shortly will spend a billion dollars a year for its housekeeping, its salaries, its expenses and the like."

Carter's reply also used relevancy when he said: "Well, it's not a matter of Republican and Democrat. It's a matter of leadership or no leadership. While Mr. Ford has vetoed, as I said earlier, four times as many bills per year as Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ford quite often puts forward a program just as a public relations stunt and never tries to put it through the Congress by working with the Congress."

Thus, while both candidates did present factual evidence concerning substance (the second test of evidence), they committed some errors and, therefore, partially violated the tests of evidence.

The third and final test of evidence to be considered here is testing the sources of evidence. While the quality of substance is deemed of utmost importance, the source of the evidence is also of prime concern. The test of sources becomes important when a person is unable to test the truth or consistency of the evidence itself. Qualities of the source such as moral qualifications, opportunity of the source to get the truth, mental qualifications of the source, and the perceived credibility or expertness of the source must all be considered when gauging the effectiveness of the evidence.[36]

In the first Ford/Carter debate, both candidates referred to "expert witnesses" as they cited various sources of perceived credibility, qualification, and expertise. McBurney and Mills say that, "Statement of opinion from 'authorities' or 'experts' are widely used in support of contentions. In routine argumentative discourse we cite this kind of evidence to corroborate our own views. In effect, the advocate says his point is valid because it is supported by 'someone who should know.' "[37]

Both Ford and Carter were able to cite high credible sources. Carter, when discussing the Federal Energy Agency, cited The Wall Street Journal as his source. He also referred to respected authority

figures including Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower when he suggested that the issue was leadership, and not necessarily party affiliation. For example, he mentioned the Bureau of Census when he described the 50% increase in expenditures by the state government while Carter was Governor of Georgia.

The test of sources may also be used to attack an opponent on any particular issue. Carter employed this tactic by associating Nixon and Ford. Carter stated: "Well, Mr. Ford takes the same attitude that the Republicans always take . . . . I remember when Herbert Hoover was against jobs for people. I remember when Al Landon was against Social Security and later President Nixon 16 years ago telling the public that John Kennedy's proposals would bankrupt the country and would double the cost."[38]

Thus, both Ford and Carter repeatedly used high credible sources, noteworthy sources, and famous names to bolster their use of evidence.

In conclusion, I have discussed several major types of evidence used by Ford and Carter in the first presidential debate of 1976. The types of evidence considered were (1) statistics, (2) illustration, (3) authority, and (4) analogy (or comparison). Three major tests for gauging the accuracy of the candidate's evidence were also presented. The use of statistical evidence and an illustration were the most frequent types of evidence used. Although both candidates were guilty of incorrect evidence in several cases, they did employ all four of these major types of evidence. Carter used 99 citations of evidence compared to Ford's 76 citations. The application of the three tests of evidence: (1) operational definition, (2) tests of substance, and (3) tests of sources; revealed that Ford committed more errors in the presentation of evidence than Carter. Ironically, Ford used fewer pieces of evidence and made more errors (inaccurate statements), yet was considered the "winner" of the first debate by major opinion polls and surveys. This illustrates the controversial nature of the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, concerning the presentation of evidence or supporting materials. Further research is necessary if one hopes to gain a clearer picture of evidence and its importance in various contexts and situations. For example, a comparison of all three Ford/Carter presidential debates together with an examination of evidence used in the Nixon/Kennedy debates would serve as possible starting points for this political communication genre. The major contradiction of Ford "winning" with "inferior" evidence which the

present essay reveals, suggests that Carter may have been more "effective" and "accurate" in his presentation of evidence as measured by the three tests. However, to what extent did other factors, such as the nonverbal behavior of the candidates affect the impression of the American voting public? Future research may answer such questions.

NOTES

[1]Aristotle, Rhetoric, translated by W. Rhys Roberts, The Modern Library, published by Random House, Inc., 1954, p. 27.

[2]Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehninger, Principles and Types of Speech Communication, Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1974, p. 300. 7th ed.

[3]James C. McCroskey, "The Effects of Evidence in Persuasive Communication," Western Speech, XXXI (Summer 1967), p. 197.

[4]Robert S. Cathcart, "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence," Speech Monographs, XXII (August 1955), pp. 227-233.

[5]Erwin Paul Bettinghaus, Jr., "The Relative Effect of the Use of Testimony in a Persuasive Speech upon the Attitude of Listeners," unpublished thesis (Bradley, 1933).

[6]Jerry M. Anderson and Paul J. Dovre, editors, Readings in Argumentation, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968, p. 204.

[7]Richard B. Gregg, "Some Hypothesis for the Study of the Psychology of Evidence," paper read at the 1964 SAA Convention.

[8]James C. McCroskey, "A Summary of Experimental Research on The Effects of Evidence in Persuasive Communication, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. LV, April 1969, p. 172.

[9]Ibid., p. 176.

[10]James H. McBurney and Glen E. Mills, "Introduction to Argumentation and Debate," from Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society, 2nd ed., p. 4.

[11]Ibid., p. 8.

[12]Gerald R. Miller, "Psychological Aspects of Evidence," from Readings in Argumentation, ed. by Jerry M. Anderson and Paul J. Dovre, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968, p. 207. For a current review of research on the topic of evidence, see the special issue of the Western Journal of Speech Communication, (Winter, 1977). Monroe and Ehninger Principle and Types (see note 2).

NOTES

[13]Miller, p. 207.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo Braden, second edition, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press, 1970), p. 399.

[16]Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehninger, Principles and Types of Speech Communication, 7th ed., Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1974, p. 300.

[17]Western Journal of Speech Communication, (Winter, 1977).

[18]"When Their Power Failed," from Time Magazine, October 4, 1976, p. 16 and "After Big Debate-The Picture Now," from U.S. News and World Report, October 4, 1976, p. 12.

[19]"The Race: Stay Tuned," from Newsweek, October 4, 1976, p. 22; U.S. News and World Report, October 4, 1976, p. 12; and Time Magazine, October 4, 1976, p. 16.

[20]Gerald R. Miller, "Evidence and Argument," from Perspectives on Argumentation, edited by Gerald A. Miller and Thomas R. Nilsen, Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1966, p. 37.

[21]Ibid., p. 38.

[22]Gerald M. Goldhaber, Jerry K. Frye, D. Thomas Porter, and Michael Yates, "The Image of the Candidates: A Communication Analysis of the Ford/Carter Debates I and II," Department of Communication, State University of New York at Buffalo, October 14, 1976, Table 7.

[23]Ibid., p. 10.

[24]Monroe and Ehninger, Principles and Types of Speech Communication, p. 306.

[25]Goldhaber, Frye, Porter and Yates, "The Image of the Candidates: A Communication Analysis of the Ford/Carter Debates I and II," Table 7.

NOTES

[26]Miller, "Evidence and Argument," from Perspectives on Argumentation, p.43.

[27]Goldhaber, Frye, Porter, and Yates, "The Image of the Candidates: A Communication Analysis of the Ford/Carter Debates I and II," Table 7.

[28]Austin J. Freeley, "Presenting the Case: Composition," from Argumentation and Debate, 4th ed., Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1976, p. 291.

[29]Monroe and Ehninger, Principles and Types of Speech Communication, p. 304.

[30]Freeley, "Presenting the Case: Composition," from Argumentation and Debate, pp. 91-92.

[31]Miller, "Evidence and Argument," from Perspectives on Argumentation, p. 40.

[32]Fred N. Kerlinger, "Constructs, Variables, and Definitions," from Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964, p. 31.

[33]This and all remaining quotes from text of The New York Times, Friday, September 24, 1976, Section A, pp. 20-22.

[34]McBurney and Mills, "Evidence," from Argumentation and Debate, pp. 99-104.

[35]Time, October 4, 1976, p. 17. Also, The New York Times provided a summary of Ford and Carter statements that were proven inaccurate when compared to available resources. These specific examples under my subheadings "consistency" and "sufficiency" have been adapted from the Time Magazine and the Buffalo Evening News stories. See Buffalo Evening News 9/24/76, p. 11.

[36]McBurney and Mills, Argumentation and Debate, pp. 104-108.

[37]Ibid., pp. 107-108.

[38]The New York Times, Friday, 9/24/76, Section A, pp. 20-22.

TABLE 1

Candidate Coverage of Debate Sub-Topics *

Topic: Domestic Issues and Economic Policy

Total number of words in debate coverage: Ford (4,857) Carter (5,818)

Sub-Topic	Number of words by Sub-Topic		% of total debate coverage by candidate	
	Ford	Carter	Ford **	Carter **
(1) Economy	2,524	3,204	51.9%	55.0%
(2) Nixon Pardon/Amnesty	333	177	6.8	3.0
(3) Energy Policy	273	624	5.6	10.7
(4) Crime/Intelligence Agencies	403	172	8.2	2.9
(5) Anti-Washington Attitude	564	359	11.6	6.1
(6) Reorganization of Federal Government	280	783	5.7	13.4
(7) Other Issues (trust, leadership, America's future	480	499	9.8	8.5

* Complete text of the First Presidential Debate was taken from The New York Times, Friday, September 24, 1976; Section A, pp. 20-22. All remaining quotations in this paper are from this same source of the text.

** All percentages have been rounded to the nearest tenth.

TABLE 2

Statistical Evidence Utilized In Debate Sub-Topics

(Note: Selected illustrations only are reported in Table 2)

Total Statistical Citations in Debate 1: Ford (41) Carter (24)

Sub-Topics	Ford (Statistical Citation)	Carter (Statistical Citation)
(1) Economy	"For the last 10 years the budget of the United States has grown from about 11 percent per year."	"It's just a welfare program for the rich. As a matter of fact, 25 percent of the total tax deductions go for only 1 percent of the richest people in this country, and over 50 percent of the tax credits go for 14 percent of the richest people in this country."
(2) Nixon Pardon/Amnesty	"The amnesty program that I recommended in Chicago in September of 1974 would allow draft evaders and military deserters the opportunity to earn their good record back. Almost 14 to 15,000 did take advantage of that program."	"I think it's accurate to say that two years ago when Mr. Nixon—Mr. Ford—put in this amnesty that three times as many deserters were excused as were the ones who evaded the draft."
(3) Energy Policy	"I recommended to the Congress that we should increase coal production in this country from 600 million tons a year to a billion, 200 million tons by 1985."	"When Mr. Nixon made his famous speech on Operation Independence we were importing about 35 percent of our oil. Now we've increased that amount 25 percent. We now import about 44 percent of our oil."

TABLE 2 (continued)

Sub-Topic	Ford (Statistical Citation)	Carter (Statistical Citation)
(4) Crime/Intelligence Agencies	"You are familiar, of course with the fact that I am the first President in 30 years who has reorganized the intelligence agencies in the Federal Government: the C.I.A., the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Nationa' Security Agency and the others."	"We've got a short distinction between white collar crime. The big shots who are rich, or influential very seldom go to jail; those who are poor and who have no influence quite often are the ones who are punished." "... . like the treatment of drug addicts, I have found there were 13 different agencies that I had to go to manage the drug treatment program."
(5) Anti-Washington Attitude	"The anti-Washington feeling, in my opinion, ought to be focused on the Congress of the United States. For example, this Congress very shortly will spend a billion dollars a year for its housekeeping, its salaries, its expenses and the like."	"Well, it's not a matter of Republican and Democrat. It's a matter of leadership or no leadership .... While Mr. Ford has vetoed, as I said earlier, four times as many bills per year as Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ford quite often puts forward a program just as a public relations stunt and never tries to put it through the Congress by working with the Congress."
(6) Reorganization of Federal Government	"In the four years that Governor Carter was Governor of the State of Georgia, expenditures by the government went up over 50 percent. Employees of the government in Georgia during his term of office went up over 25 percent .... In the term that I've been President—some two years—we have reduced federal employment by 11,000 .... So I think our record of cutting back employees, plus the failure .... shows which is the better plan."	"When I took over we had a bureaucratic mess, like we have in Washington now, and we had 300 agencies, departments, bureaus, commissions, some fully budgeted, some not, but all having responsibility to carry out. They were in conflict. And we cut those 300 agencies and so forth down substantially. We eliminated 278 of them."